REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending.

Rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 26 and dependent claims, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 27, 29-31, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagaoka et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,656) in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (1997). Applicant traverses these rejections, but in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has cancelled independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 26, and dependent claims 2, 14, and 27.

In addition, Applicant has rewritten claims 3, 15, and 28 in independent form, including all the limitations of their respective base claims and intervening claims. For reasons discussed below, claims 3, 15, and 28 are believed to be allowable.

Dependent claims 4 – 12 have been amended to depend in some way from claim 3. Therefore, claims 4 – 12 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3.

Dependent claims 16 – 24 have been amended to depend in some way from claim 15. Therefore, claims 16 – 24 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

Dependent claims 29 – 37 have been amended to depend in some way from claim 28. Therefore, claims 29 – 37 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 28.

Rejections of claims 3, 12, 15, 24, 28, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claims 3, 12, 15, 24, 28, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagaoka et al.* and the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary and in further view of *Comay et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,489). Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons, and respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3, 15, and 28 recite, in part, a kernel-side portion that notifies the client device using at least one message selected from a group of messages comprising a TCP reset message and an ICMP destination unreachable message, as applicable. The Examiner states that these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by *Nagaoka et al.* and the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, as evidenced by *Comay et al.*

By contrast, *Nagaoka et al.* discusses execution servers 120 and 320 that do receive a transaction command from a terminal and then execute the command if the operator or group are authorized. See *Nagaoka et al.*, col. 8, lines 22 – 32. The execution servers 120 and 320 of *Nagaoka et al.* must receive the command in order to determine whether to execute it. A connection (e.g., communication line 200) exists in *Nagaoka et al.* to receive the transaction command. By contrast, a TCP reset message and an ICMP destination unreachable imply that no connection exists. A TCP reset message and an ICMP destination unreachable message are inconsistent with receipt of the transaction command by the execution servers 120 and 320. In *Nagaoka et al.*, a TCP reset message or an ICMP destination unreachable message would be meaningless and incorrect because the transaction command is actually received over an existing connection. As such, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine *Nagaoka et al.* and *Comay et al.*

In addition neither *Nagaoka et al.* nor *Comay et al.* teach or suggest an ICMP destination unreachable message. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed *Nagaoka et al.* and *Comay et al.* and has found no reference to ICMP. Therefore, *Nagaoka et al.* and *Comay et al.* fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of any of claims 3, 15, and 28, either individually or in combination.

Furthermore, claim 3 recites, in part, a method for controlling access to a server device by at least one client device including causing a user-side portion of a network server logic within the server device to selectively specify at least one network from which the user-side portion would accept client device information. The method includes causing a kernel-side portion of the network server logic to accept the client device information only if the client device information has been provided via the specified network. Thus, in claim 3, the user-side portion and the kernel-side portion are within the server device to which access is being controlled.

By contrast, *Nagaoka et al.* disclose separate subsystems for groups that are geographically distant from each other. See *Nagaoka et al.*, col. 7, lines 1 – 3; Fig. 1. Each of the subsystems corresponds to a particular group, and includes an authorization system that determines whether operators in the corresponding group are authorized to log into the subsystem. See *id.*, col. 7, lines 43-55. Because the subsystems and their authorization systems correspond to geographically distant groups, the subsystems and their authorization systems are not within the server device to which access is being controlled. Therefore, *Nagaoka et al.* fail to teach or suggest a user-side portion and a kernel-side portion that are within the server device to which access is being controlled, as recited in claim 3.

Additionally, *Nagaoka et al.* fails to teach or suggest causing a kernel-side portion of the network server logic to <u>accept the client device information only if the client device information has been provided via a specified network</u>. At column 8, lines 46 – 55, cited by the Office, *Nagaoka et al.* teaches an execution server 320 that accepts information from another subsystem 100, regardless of the group name, via a communication line 200. The execution server then <u>executes a command in the client side information</u> based on a group name in the client side information. Thus, rather than accepting client device information <u>only if the client device information has been provided via the specified network</u>, *Nagaoka et al.*'s execution server 320 <u>always accepts the transaction command</u>.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 3, 15, and 28 are believed to be allowable. Because claims 12, 24, and 37 depend from claims 3, 15, and 28, respectively, claims 12, 24, and 37 are also believed to be allowable by virtue of the dependency.

Rejections of claims 7, 19, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claims 7, 19 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nagaoka et al.* and the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary and in further view of *Skopp et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,739). Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons, and respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

As discussed above, claims 3, 15, and 28 are believed to be allowable over the cited art. Claims 7, 19, and 32 depend from claims 3, 15, and 28, respectively. Therefore, claims 7, 19 and 32 are believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claims 3, 15, and 28.

Lee & Hayes, PLLC   16   MS1-652US

Conclusion

The pending claims have been placed in condition for allowance and are patentable over the cited art and should therefore be allowed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 10/25/04

By: _Damon A. Rieth_
Damon A. Rieth
Reg. No. 52,167
(303) 539-0265 x 237